DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 549 EA 026 279

AUTHOR Monteith, Dianne S.
TITLE Special Education Training: A Must for Today's School Leaders.
PUB DATE Aug 94
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (48th, Indian Wells, CA, August 9-13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Administrator Effectiveness; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Inclusive Schools; Internship Programs; *Leadership Training; Management Development; *Special Education; Student Experience; Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

Implementing the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and/or the full inclusion philosophy (which advocates disabled students participating in regular classrooms) creates new needs and places new demands on public school personnel. This paper presents a review of research studies that examined the extent to which administrators had knowledge of special education and the laws pertaining to it. A survey conducted by the department of educational administration at South Carolina State University received responses from 120 administrators enrolled in graduate educational administration programs throughout South Carolina, southern North Carolina, and northern Georgia. The findings of the survey and other research studies found that administrators lacked knowledge of special-education law and that endorsement did not require a knowledge of special education. The administrators expressed a need and desire for training in special education. The paper presents a suggested course of study and special-education competencies to bridge the gap between theory and practice. The course includes field experiences, culminating in an internship. Competencies would be assigned to four areas: core competencies assessment competencies special problems/topics, and internship/practicum. Five courses are suggested: (1) introduction to exceptional children and youth; (2) educating exceptional children and youth; (3) assessment in special education; (4) special topics in educational administration; and (5) internship. The survey instrument is attached. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 549

Special Education Training: A Must for Today's School Leaders

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Monteith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Dianne S. Monteith
South Carolina State University
Orangeburg, SC

Presented at the Annual NCPEA Conference
Palm Springs, CA
August 9-13, 1994

EA 026 279

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

In April, 1991, at the announcement of the national education strategy, AMERICA 2000, President Bush stated: "We are responsible for educating everyone among us, regardless of background or disability." This statement makes it clear that this reform package applies to all Americans and that states will be held accountable for adequately addressing the National Education Goals.

Implementing the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and/or the full inclusion philosophy (i.e., disabled students participate in regular classrooms) creates new needs and places new demands on public school personnel.

One significant issue in the call for reforms has been on the quality of training programs for principals and the teachers whom they supervise. Widespread agreement exists about the crucial role of principals (elementary, middle, and secondary) in producing effective schools. Focusing solely on principals and ignoring other critical factors such as teachers, textbooks, curriculum, school funding, and the leadership of superintendents, other members of the administrative team, and the school boards would be a mistake. However, it is the principal who sets the tone for

the school and oversees the organization and implementation of an effective instructional program (Greenfield, 1987; Smith, 1989; Sergiovanni, 1990; & Olivia, 1993).

In 1985, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education (OSEP) funded a series of grants for the purpose of investigating instruction plus organizational and administrative issues related to educating students with disabilities in the regular classroom environment. This unified system of delivery has come to be known as the Regular Education Initiative (REI). In order to accomplish a partnership between regular and special education, Madeline Will, in a U.S. Department of Education report titled, "Educating Students with Learning Problems: A shared Responsibility" (1986), made the following recommendation: "principals should be empowered to control all programs and resources at the building level." With Will's endorsement of this initiative, many experts in the field have become advocates of educating children and youth with disabilities in a single system (Wang, Reynolds, & Walbert, 1988; Lipsky & Gartner, 1988; Lilly, 1988; Kauffman & Hallahan, 1991; Lloyd, Sing, & Repp, 1991). As this movement becomes adopted by school districts, principals must command an understanding of special education to effectively implement procedural requirements and provide

appropriate educational services for disabled students in their schools.

Even if the Regular Education Initiative does not fully become a reality, the "least restrictive environment" (LRE) concept will continue to be a major component of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (1990). LRE means that students with disabilities should be moved to self-contained special education classes only when the severity of their disabling condition is so great that the student's needs cannot be accommodated in the regular educational setting (Salend, 1990; Turnbull, 1991). Hence, principals need to be knowledgeable regardless of what reforms they are addressing.

Most principals, however, do not have the knowledge of the instructional and programmatic needs of disabled children. At the 70th annual convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (Baltimore, 1991), Aspedon (1992) presented the results of a study titled "Principals' Attitudes Towards Special Education: Results and Implications of a Comprehensive Research Study." Some significant findings were: (1) over 40% of principals had never had any special education course; (2) over 85% of principals felt that formal training in special education is needed in order to be a successful building principal; (3)

over 80% of principals had moderate to very high interest in receiving special education training; and (4) despite lack of special education training, over 75% of principals had exclusive or shared responsibility for supervising and evaluating special education teachers in their schools. This study found striking similarities between its findings and the work of Davis (1989). This comparison indicated that little had been done in the ensuing years to assist building principals in assuming ownership for special education programs and students with disabilities. In addition, research has established that principals generally have negative attitudes about assuming additional responsibilities related to the educational needs of disabled children because they have not had the training necessary to develop effective programs (Olson, 1982; O'Neil, 1988; Hirth & Valesky, 1989; Weinstein, 1989). These studies with regular education teachers, special education teachers, and administrators indicated that the groups expressed the need for training in order to implement changes in classroom services legally mandated.

Valesky and Hirth (1992) surveyed state directors of special education to examine state requirements for certification endorsements of school administrators to determine whether they require a knowledge of special

education law, specifically, and special education in general. This study found that only 33% of all regular administrator endorsements were required to have a knowledge of special education law and that no state requirement for a general knowledge of special education existed for 45% of the regular administrator endorsements.

In an earlier study, Hirth and Valesky (1991) surveyed colleges and universities in the United States offering graduate degrees in school administration to determine requirements for special education and special education law knowledge for administrative endorsements. This study found that only 27% of all regular administrator endorsements offered required knowledge of special education law and 57% of endorsements offered by the universities had no requirement for a knowledge of special education.

A recent North Carolina Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) report (NCDI, 1991-1995), which presents current data available from many sources (e.g., teacher certification, descriptions of trends in various disability areas) lists "limited administrator knowledge and support" as a barrier to effective service delivery. In addition, in regard to inservice training opportunities, the report specifically states that administrators should be instructed in the following areas related to students with

disabilities: (a) personnel development and support; (b) behavior management; (c) development of reasonable expectations for disabled students and programs; (d) legal issues relating to identification and placement; (e) legal issues relating to expulsion and out-of-school and in-school suspension; (f) systems for offering support for disabled children service providers; (g) placement decision-making skills; (h) competencies in the mainstreaming process and implementation; and (i) advocacy for disabled students' families. While these training areas were specifically listed under the behaviorally-emotionally disabled program, administrators should have these training opportunities for all areas of disabilities.

The South Carolina State University Department of Educational Administration (1993) conducted a survey at the building level to determine to what extent practitioners felt they already possessed knowledge necessary to effectively administer programs for students with disabilities and if they would be interested in training and/or a degree concentration in disabilities related supervision (e.g., behavior management, personnel evaluation). The sample was drawn from principals, assistant principals, and supervisors from South Carolina, southern North Carolina, and northern Georgia enrolled in

the Ed.S. and Ed.D. programs and graduate students at South Carolina State University. One hundred and twenty individuals responded to the survey.

Significant findings indicated: (a) 75% of the administrators had no formal training in special education; (b) that what they did know about special education came from memos sent to them from the administration office or state or through "making mistakes;" (c) over 90% of the administrators indicated that formal special education training was needed in order to be an effective school leader; and (d) 89% indicated that they would be interested in participating in a training program. The Survey questions and results is presented in Appendix A. A survey conducted at North Carolina Central University involving principals enrolled in classes at that institution as well as administrators in Durham County, Granville County, and Wake County indicated similar results. In another study (Langley, 1993) involving 103 secondary principals in South Carolina, 97% indicated that course work in administration of special education programs would be useful to extremely useful, and 95% felt that coursework in administration/ supervision of learning disabled programs would also be very beneficial in terms of performing their job duties. These

studies clearly support the need to train school administrators in special education.

It is clear that principals need and want training in special education if the current trend of educating the majority of children with disabilities by implementing the full inclusion policy or LRE mandate continues. Thus administrator preparation institutions should design and implement administrator training programs that address the need for knowledge of special education.

As indicated earlier, principals and other administrators felt the need for additional special education training in both theory and practice. In view of this, a suggested course of study (special education component/competencies) could focus on bridging the gap between theory and practical application. Therefore, each course, except for a Special Topics course, should have a field experience component, giving students the opportunity to immediately be involved with disabled students. Also, the sequence of courses should culminate in an internship where participants would have a more intensive experience.

Competencies in this special education component may arbitrarily be assigned to four areas: core, assessment, special problems/topics, and internship/practicum. These competencies identify specific knowledge and skills which

would enable principals to more effectively perform job tasks related to special education. Following are examples of these competencies.

Core Competencies

1. Identifying disabled students
2. Being familiar with definitions of various disabling conditions
3. Being aware of current legislation related to individuals with disabilities
4. Understanding the historical influence of various legislation
5. Understanding the etiology incidence and prevalence figures of various disabling conditions
6. Understanding the educational needs of students with disabilities
7. Understanding the concept of least restrictive environment
8. Identifying effective classroom methods appropriate for varying handicapping conditions
9. Adapting and modifying curriculum materials
10. Using technology effectively
11. Understanding how to use assessment data to plan instructional programs

Assessment

12. Understanding basic considerations in psychological and educational assessment of students (including legal and ethical considerations

13. Applying assessment information to educational decision making (understanding how to write and evaluate IEPs)

14. Understanding the general referral and assessment process as well as how it relates to specific states

15. Acquiring Level I and Level II computer competency

Special Problems/Topics

16. Understanding current topics/problems in administration as they relate to special education (e.g., LRE--achieving full inclusion, mainstreaming, disciplining students with disabilities, advocacy, and legal issues)

Internship/Practicum

17. Developing specific administrative knowledge/competencies essential to school administration with emphasis in special education.

18. Synthesizing theoretical knowledge and applied skills gained in the classroom setting.

19. Acquiring practical experience which leads to increasing competency with emphasis in special education.

20. Gaining experience in formative and summative staff evaluation in a special education setting.

21. Developing an analytical paper or doing a project related to some problem identified in relation to special education at the building or district level.

Special Education Courses

The following five suggested courses would address these administrative competencies necessary for principals to effectively supervise special education programs and personnel.

1. Introduction to Exceptional Children and Youth: This course would cover a general overview of exceptional children and youth. Major emphasis should focus on critical issues such as current legislation, historical influence, definitions, incidence, prevalence figures, identification, etiology, educational adaptations and cultural diversity. Additionally, the course should provide participants an increased awareness, knowledge, and understanding of the educational needs of children and youth and the least restrictive environment. Students should spend a 10 hour field experience observing students with disabilities.

2. Educating Exceptional Children and Youth: This course would be an extension of the introductory course. Students would be exposed to specific methods and materials that could be used effectively in the classroom setting with the varying handicapping conditions. Emphases would be on

adapting and modifying curriculum materials, effectively using technology, and using assessment data to plan instructional programs. This course would include a 10-hour field experience of individual and small group instruction with students with disabilities.

3. Assessment in Special Education: This course would describe basis considerations in psychological and educational assessment of students to include legal and ethical considerations is assessment. Basic measurements concepts and the most common domains in which assessment of abilities and in which assessment of skill attainment are conducted would also be discussed. Special consideration would be given to applying assessment information to educational decision making. This course would also address general referral and assessment processes as well as those that are state specific. The student would also acquire Level I and Level II computer competencies. This field experience would involve administering tests to three disabled students - high school, middle school, and elementary school.

4. Special Topics in Educational Administration: A special topics seminar would focus on various topics/problems in administration as they relate to special education. Examples of topics include REI and/or Achieving Full

Inclusion, Mainstreaming, Disciplining Students with Disabilities, Advocacy, and Legal Issues.

5. Internship in Educational Administration: This course would provide a supervised internship in educational administration with an emphasis in special education. This experience should be as realistic as possible. It should also ensure that principals enter the professional job market with the skills needed for survival and success in a culturally diverse setting. This internship should also incorporate a variety of structured requirements and activities that collectively "bridge the gap" between methods and/or laboratory courses and actual independent professional administration.

Although more in-depth knowledge and training may provide optimal preparation to administer special education programs, the foregoing 15 credit hour concentration seems more realistic in terms of program requirements and students' needs/interests. Of greatest importance is that principals and other administrators have adequate knowledge and skills to administer all programs for which they are accountable.

References

Aspedon, M. (1992, April). Principals' attitudes toward special education: Results and implications of a comprehensive study. A paper presented at the 70th Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Baltimore, MD.

Brooks, J. (1992). Attitudes of school administrators toward national board teacher certification. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. South Carolina State University, Orangeburg.

Davis, W.E. (1989). The regular education initiative debate: Its promises and problems. Exceptional Children, 55, 440-446.

Greenfield, W. (1987). Instructional leadership: Allyn & Bacon.

Hirth, M., & Valesky, T. (1989). Principals' knowledge of special education law. National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, 6, (3), 130-141.

Hirth, M., & Volecky, T. (1991). Survey of universities: Special education knowledge requirements in school administration programs. Planning and Changing, 2(3), 165-167.

IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act--PL.101-476). (1990). Formerly PL. 94-142. Federal Register, Section 121 a.S.

Jones, E. H., & Montenegro, X. P. (1988). Women and minorities in school administration. Arlington: American Association of School Administrators.

Kauffman, J. M., & Hallahan. (1991). Toward a comprehensive service delivery system. In J. I. Goodlad & T. C. Lovitt (Eds.). Integrating general and special education. Columbus, OH: Merrill/Macmillan.

Langley, A. (1993). A comparative study of university preparation programs in relation to job responsibilities of secondary principals in South Carolina public high schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, South Carolina State University, Orangeburg.

Lilly, M. S. (1988). The regular education initiative: Alternative perspectives on concepts, issues, and models. Sycamore, IL: Sycamore Press.

Lipsky, D. K. & Gartner, A. (1987). Capable achievement and worthy of respect: Education for handicapped students as if they were full-fledged human beings. Exceptional Children, 54, 69-74.

Lloyd, J. W., Singh, N. N., & Repp, A. C. (Eds.). (1991). The regular education initiative: Alternative perspectives on concepts, issues, and models. Sycamore, IL: Sycamore Press.

McDowell, L., & Morgan, F. B. (1990). Public elementary and secondary schools and agencies in the United States and outlying areas: School year 1988-89. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

O'Neil, J. (1988, September). The regular education iniatiative: Seeking integration between special regular education. ASCD Curriculum Update, 4-5.

Olivia, P. (1993). Supervision for today's schools. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Olson, J. (1982). Public secondary principal's knowledge of an attitude twoard PL 94-142 and their relationship to the provision of special education services at the building level. Disssertation Abstracts International, 43, 377.

Reiff, H. B., Evans, E. D., & Cass, M. (1991, September/October). Special education requirements for general education certification: A national survey of current practices. Exceptional Children, 12(5), 56-60.

Salend, S. (1990). Effective mainstreaming. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Sergiovani, T. J. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace, Janovich.

Smith, W. J., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Arlington, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Special Report. (1992, May 7). Top degree producers. Black Issues in Higher Education, 9(5), 16-46.

Turnbull, H. R. (1991). Free appropriate public education: The law and children with disabilities. (2nd ed.). Denver: Love.

Valesky, T., & Hirth, M. (1992). Survey of the states: Special education knowledge requirements for school administrators. Exceptional Children, 58(5), 399-406.

Villegas, A. (1991). Culturally responsive pedagogy for the 1990s and beyond. A report for Educational Testing Service and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Wang, M. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1988). Integrating the children of the second system. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 248-251.

Will, M. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52, 411-415

Weinstein, D.F. (1989). The administrator and special education education programs: Quality control of placement insturction. ERS Spectrum, 1 (3), 35-40.

APPENDIX A

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

CRITICAL NEEDS SURVEY

Concerns of Administrators who Deal with Special Students

Name_____ Sex M=70 F=50 Race W=28 B=90 O= 2

Present Position_____ Years of Experience_____

Areas of Certification _____

Total School Population 670 Average

Number Responding = 120

Directions: Please circle your response to the following questions.

		1 Strongly agree	2 Somewhat agree	3 Agree	4 Somewhat disagree	5 Strongly disagree
1.	My educational background has adequately prepared me to meet the needs of special needs students.	2	3	8	33	74
2.	Additional training is needed to implement legally mandated changes in classroom services for special needs students.	73	36	6	4	1
3.	Additional training in meeting the needs of special needs students would enhance my professional development.	40	45	32	2	1

4. Number of contact hours I have received in administering to the needs of special needs students.

A. 36 0 B. 54 3-6 C. 18 6-9 D. 9 9-12 E. 3 Above 12

5. What has been a major source of information concerning administering to the needs of special students.

34 A. Memos from the central office
28 B. Information from the State Department of Education
28 C. Inservices
30 D. Trial and error

6. I would participate in a program designed to train administrators to meet the needs of special needs students.

107 A. Yes 13 B. No

7. I would be more inclined to participate in such a program if financial help were available.

114 A. Yes 6 B. No

8. What percent of responsibility do you have in the supervision and evaluation of the special education program?

A. 12 Less than 25% B. 53 25% to 50% C. 40 50% to 75% D. 15 Above 75%

9. What percent of students in your school exhibit characteristics of special needs students, but are not now being served in special programs?

A. 100 Less than 25% B. 20 25% to 50% C. 0 50% to 75% D. 0 Above 75%

10. Please complete the following information concerning the special education program in your school.

A. Number of students classified: 68 Average

B. Type of Classifications in Your School — Number of Students

_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____